UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,744	01/12/2001	Ralf Hofmann	P-4592	9742

7590 02/26/2004

EXAMINER
KLINGER, SCOTT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	7

Forrest Gunnison
Gunnison, McKay & Hodgson, L.L.P.
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/759,744	HOFMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott M. Klinger	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3, 4.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-46 are pending.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file. The effective filing date for subject matter in the application is 14 January 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 35 recites the limitations "said user device", "said data", "said presentation requirements", and "said presentation scheme". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall

> have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6, 11, 15, 16, 27, 28, 31, 34, 36, 39, and 41-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bickmore et al. ("Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users", hereinafter "Bickmore"). Bickmore discloses a system for dynamically filtering and re-authoring web pages for mobile users.

In referring to claims 1, 2, and 46, Bickmore shows,

- Receiving a request from said user device for said data:

  "Digestor intercepts requests for web pages and returns reauthored versions rather than the original pages."

  -Bickmore, section 3.1, paragraph 1 (page 536)

- Identifying presentation requirements of said user device:

  "The first thing that users of Digestor will typically do is specify the size of display for their device and indicate the size of their default browser font; these are required in order to estimate the screen area requirements of the text blocks."

  -Bickmore, section 3.1, paragraph 1 (page 536)

- Selecting a presentation scheme for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements wherein upon application of said presentation scheme to said data, new data presentable on said user device is generated:

  "Figure 1 shows the flow of documents among the user, Digestor and the web server. Re-authored documents (each usually partitioned into many smaller pages) are cached to improve efficiency."

  -Bickmore, section 3.1, paragraph 1 (page 536)

"Digestor also supports cellular phones that have very small text displays. Many cellular phones cannot display images. They also do not support links embedded in the text. Instead, they provide programmable buttons that can be used for navigation. Figure 3 illustrates Digestor's re-authoring capability for a cellular phone display."

-Bickmore, section 3.1, paragraph 3 (page 536)

- Applying said presentation scheme to said data to create said new data:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) shows the step of applying said presentation scheme to said data

In referring to claim 3, Bickmore shows,

- Said applying said presentation scheme to said data is performed by said user device:

  "Although Digestor is currently designed to work as a proxy server within a document pull model, it could easily be adapted to a range of other possible architectures. Digestor could be used server-side within a document push model to re-author pages before they are pushed to the client (e.g. as email messages). Digestor could also be run directly on the client to provide dynamic re-authoring-allowing the user to interactively modify the re-authoring strategy until an optimal rendering is achieved for the purpose at hand."

  -Bickmore, section 6, paragraph 3 (page 545)

In referring to claim 4, Bickmore shows,

- Transmitting said new data to said user device to allow the presentation of said new data on said user device:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) shows the step of transmitting said new data to said user device

In referring to claim 5, Bickmore shows,

- Retrieving said data:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) shows the step of retrieving said data

In referring to claims 2 and 6, Bickmore shows,

- Applying said presentation scheme to said retrieved data to create said new data:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) shows the step of applying said presentation scheme to said retrieved data

In referring to claims 11 and 36, Bickmore shows,

- Receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on the user device:

  "The simple navigation commands described above can also be used to navigate among a set of linked web pages through the use of the LINKEDPAGE page object type. For example, GO FIRST LINKEDPAGE moves to the first hypertext link within the current context, loads the referenced page and moves the current context to the root of its AST"

  -Bickmore, section 3.4.4, paragraph 1 (page 543)

- Transferring said request to a portlet wherein said portlet retrieves data specified in said request over a network and further wherein said data has one format in a plurality of source data formats:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) the presentation manager (Digestor) is a portal; therefore requests would be sent to portlets

- Analyzing said request to determine a user data format that is supported by said user device: (see claim 1 rejection, above)
- Selecting a presentation scheme to convert said data from said source data format to said user data format: (see claim 1 rejection, above)
- Converting said data from said source data format to said user data format using said presentation scheme: (see claim 1 rejection, above)

In referring to claim 15, Bickmore shows,

- Said receiving is performed by a web server:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) shows the web server receives a request

In referring to claim 16, Bickmore shows,

- Said transferring said request is performed by a portlet manager

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) the presentation manager (Digestor) is a portal, which is a portlet manager

In referring to claim 27, Bickmore shows,

- A web server:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) shows a web server
- A presentation manager coupled to said web server:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) a presentation manager coupled to said web server (Digestor)

- At least one portlet coupled to said presentation manager:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) the presentation manager (Digestor) is a portal

In referring to claim 28, Bickmore shows,

- Said at least one portlet comprises a mail portlet:

  "Digestor could be used server-side within a document push model to re-author pages before they are pushed to the client (e.g. as email messages)."

  -Bickmore, section 6, paragraph 3 (page 545)

In referring to claim 30, Bickmore shows,

- Said at least one portlet comprises an internal network information portlet:

  An internal portlet is inherent the portal shown in Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536)

In referring to claim 31, Bickmore shows,

- A storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of presentation schemes:

  A storage medium storing presentation schemes is inherent in a system that converts data using a plurality of presentation schemes

In referring to claim 34, Bickmore shows,

- A plurality of user devices coupled to said web server:

  A web server inherently implies a plurality of user devices

In referring to 39, Bickmore shows,

- Transmitting said data converted from said source data format to said user data format to said user device to allow the presentation of said data converted from said source data format to said user data format on said user device:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) shows the step of transmitting said new data to said user device

In referring to claim 41, Bickmore shows,

- Receiving a request from a user device to retrieve content associated with a portlet identifier; said request generated by selection of said portlet identifier from a plurality of portlet identifiers displayed on said user device; each of said portlet identifiers representing a different portlet; transferring said request to a portlet represented by said portlet identifier wherein said portlet retrieves said content over network:

  "The simple navigation commands described above can also be used to navigate among a set of linked web pages through the use of the LINKEDPAGE page object type. For example, GO FIRST LINKEDPAGE moves to the first hypertext link within the current context, loads the referenced page and moves the current context to the root of its AST, while GO ENCLOSING LINKEDPAGE returns the current context to the hypertext link that led to the page currently being processed (swapping a previously loaded page back in for processing).

  Traversal between pages is handled by a stack of script activations, each of which pairs script state information (including current context) with a particular URL and AST. This facilitates rapid navigation back and forth among linked pages and is required to support the GO ENCLOSING LINKEDPAGE command."

  -Bickmore, section 3.4.4, paragraphs 1-2 (page 543)

- Selecting and applying a presentation scheme for said content:

"The first thing that users of Digestor will typically do is specify the size of display for their device and indicate the size of their default browser font; these are required in order to estimate the screen area requirements of the text blocks."

-Bickmore, section 3.1, paragraph 1 (page 536)

- Transmitting said presentable content to said user device:

  Bickmore, Figure 1 (page 536) shows the step of transmitting said presentable content to said user device

In referring to claim 42, Bickmore shows,

- Identifying presentation requirements of said user device:

  "The first thing that users of Digestor will typically do is specify the size of display for their device and indicate the size of their default browser font; these are required in order to estimate the screen area requirements of the text blocks."

  -Bickmore, section 3.1, paragraph 1 (page 536)

In referring to claim 43, Bickmore shows,

- Said user device includes a user interface having an associated user device interface format; said content is not in said associated user device format:

  Bickmore, Figure 3 (page 537) shows the user interface of the user device and that the content isn't in the user device format

In referring to claim 44, Bickmore shows,

- Each of said portlet identifiers is associated with a specific source of content:

"The simple navigation commands described above can also be used to navigate among a set of linked web pages through the use of the LINKEDPAGE page object type. For example, GO FIRST LINKEDPAGE moves to the first hypertext link within the current context, loads the referenced page and moves the current context to the root of its AST"

-Bickmore, section 3.4.4, paragraph 1 (page 543)

In referring to claim 45, Bickmore shows,

- Receiving a first request from said user device to retrieve content, said request not being addressed to a specific portlet:

  Receiving a first request not being addressed to a specific portlet inherently occurs the first time a web page is requested

- Sending a list of available information sources to said user device, each of said available information sources on said list being associated with a specific portlet; receiving a second request from said user device to retrieve content, said second request generated by selection of one of said available information sources on said list, said second request being to retrieve content associated with said specific portlet:

  "The simple navigation commands described above can also be used to navigate among a set of linked web pages through the use of the LINKEDPAGE page object type. For example, GO FIRST LINKEDPAGE moves to the first hypertext link within the current context, loads the referenced page and moves the current context to the root of its AST"

  -Bickmore, section 3.4.4, paragraph 1 (page 543)

- Transferring said request to said specific portlet wherein said specific portlet retrieves said content; applying said presentation scheme to said content to create presentable

content; transmitting said presentable content to said user device: Shown in claim 1 rejection above

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-10 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore. Although Bickmore shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the systems of claim 1 and 11 (see 102 rejections, above), Bickmore does not explicitly show commands. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious application of the system disclosed by Bickmore.

Bickmore discloses that the user will configure the systems display settings

> *"The first thing that users of Digestor will typically do is specify the size of display for their device and indicate the size of their default browser font; these are required in order to estimate the screen area requirements of the text blocks."*
>
> *-Bickmore, section 3.1, paragraph 1 (page 536)*

The setting of display properties implies the use of a command (claims 7 and 17); the setting of a specific display type is the equivalent of a command channel or article, which are also used to set a specific presentation format (claims 8-10, and 18-20).

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the

desirability and advantages of implementing the system of Bickmore so as to have a command channel and a command article, such as implied by Bickmore, in order to set the presentation format.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Miller ("An Introduction to the Resource Description Framework", hereinafter "Miller"). Although Bickmore shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the presentation manager server system of claim 27 (see 102 rejection above), Bickmore does not show at least one portlet comprises an internal network information portlet. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Bickmore as evidenced by Miller.

In analogous art, Miller discloses an introduction to the Resource Description Framework (RDF). Miller shows:

> *"The World Wide Web affords unprecedented access to distributed information. Metadata improves access to this information and RDF is a W3C proposed standard for defining the architecture necessary for supporting web metadata. RDF is an application of XML that imposes needed structural constraints to provide unambiguous methods of expressing semantics for the consistent encoding, exchange, and machine processing of metadata. RDF additionally, provides means for publishing both a human-readable and a machine-processable vocabularies designed to encourage the exchange, use and extension of metadata semantics among disparate information communities."*
>
> *- Miller, conclusion*

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Bickmore so as to use the RDF, such as

taught by Miller, in order to improve the access to information by defining a structure for metadata.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Deach et al. ("Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) Specification W3C Working Draft 21 Apr 1999", hereinafter "Deach"). Although Bickmore shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the method of claim 11 (see 102 rejection, above), Bickmore does not show said selecting a presentation scheme comprises selecting an XSL-stylesheet. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Bickmore as evidenced by Deach.

In analogous art, Deach discloses the Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) specification. Deach shows:

"XSL builds on the prior work on Cascading Style Sheets [CSS2]and the Document Style Semantics and Specification Language [DSSSL]. XSL provides the most of the formatting objects and properties of CSS. (Conceptually, the formatting objects of CSS are indicated by using the "display" property of CSS on some existing source element.) Over 90 percent of the properties in XSL are properties that are already defined in CSS. This set of properties (and formatting objects), however, is not sufficient to accomplish all the goals of XSL. In particular, this version of XSL introduces a model for pagination and layout that can be extended, in a straightforward way, to page structures beyond the simple page models described in this specification.

...

XSL was developed to allow a designer to control the features needed when documents are paginated as well as to provide an equivalent "frame" based structure for browsing on the Web. To achieve this control, XSL has extended the CSS set of formatting objects and formatting properties. In addition, the selection of XML source components (elements, attributes, text nodes, comments and processing

instructions) that can be styled is an extension of the CSS selector set."

- Deach, section 1.2, paragraphs 1 and 3

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Bickmore so as to use an XSL-stylesheet to implement the presentation scheme, such as taught by Deach, in order to allow the user to fully control the formatting of the data.

Claims 13, 14, 21, 23-26, 37, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Freed et al. (RFC 2046, hereinafter "Freed").

In referring to claims 13, 14, 21, 37, 38, and 40, Bickmore shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including:

- The method of claim 11 (see 102 rejection, above)
- Receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on the user device (see claim 11, 102 rejection above)
- Transferring said request to a portlet wherein said portlet retrieves data specified in said request over a network and further wherein said data has one format in a plurality of source data formats (see claim 11, 102 rejection above)
- Analyzing said request to determine a user data format that is supported by said user device (see claim 11, 102 rejection above)

- Selecting a presentation scheme to convert said data from said source data format to said user data format (see claim 11, 102 rejection above)
- Converting said data from said source data format to said user data format using said presentation scheme (see claim 11, 102 rejection above)
- Transmitting said data converted from said source data format to said user data format to said user device to allow the presentation of said data converted from said source data format to said user data format on said user device (see claim 39, 102 rejection above)

However, Bickmore does not explicitly show the data formats are MIME types. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious application of the system disclosed by Bickmore as evidenced by Freed.

In analogous art, Freed discloses Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME). Freed shows:

"Since its publication in 1982, RFC 822 has defined the standard format of textual mail messages on the Internet. Its success has been such that the RFC 822 format has been adopted, wholly or partially, well beyond the confines of the Internet and the Internet SMTP transport defined by RFC 821. As the format has seen wider use, a number of limitations have proven increasingly restrictive for the user community.

...

The limitations of RFC 822 mail become even more apparent as gateways are designed to allow for the exchange of mail messages between RFC 822 hosts and X.400 hosts. X.400 [X400] specifies mechanisms for the inclusion of non-textual material within electronic mail messages. The current standards for the mapping of X.400 messages to RFC 822 messages specify either that X.400 non-textual material must be converted to (not encoded in) IA5Text format, or that they must be discarded, notifying the RFC 822 user that discarding has occurred. This is clearly undesirable, as information that a user may wish to receive is lost. Even though a user agent may not have the

capability of dealing with the non-textual material, the user might have some mechanism external to the UA that can extract useful information from the material. Moreover, it does not allow for the fact that the message may eventually be gatewayed back into an X.400 message handling system (i.e., the X.400 message is "tunneled" through Internet mail), where the non-textual information would definitely become useful again."

- Freed, page 3, paragraphs 1 and 4

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of adjusting the system of Bickmore to use MIME data types as the data formats, such as taught by Freed, in order to maintain "compatibility with existing standards AND [for] robustness across existing practice" (Freed, page 4, paragraph 8).

In referring to claims 23-26, although Bickmore in view of Freed shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the system of claim 21 (see 103 rejection, above), Bickmore in view of Freed does not explicitly show commands. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious application of the system disclosed by Bickmore in view of Freed.

Bickmore discloses that the user will configure the systems display settings

"The first thing that users of Digestor will typically do is specify the size of display for their device and indicate the size of their default browser font; these are required in order to estimate the screen area requirements of the text blocks."

-Bickmore, section 3.1, paragraph 1 (page 536)

The setting of display properties implies the use of a command (claim 23), the setting of a specific display type is the equivalent of a command channel or article, which are also used to set a specific presentation format (claims 24-26).

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of implementing the system of Bickmore in view of Freed so as to have a command channel and a command article, such as implied by Bickmore, in order to set the presentation format.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Freed and in further view of Deach et al. ("Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) Specification W3C Working Draft 21 Apr 1999", hereinafter "Deach"). Although Bickmore in view of Freed shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the method of claim 21 (see 103 rejection, above), Bickmore in view of Freed does not show said selecting a presentation scheme comprises selecting an XSL-stylesheet. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Bickmore in view of Freed as evidenced by Deach.

In analogous art, Deach discloses the Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) specification. Deach shows:

(*See Deach, section 1.2, paragraphs 1 and 3, quoted above*)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Bickmore in view of Freed so as to use an XSL-stylesheet to implement the presentation scheme, such as taught by Deach, in order to allow the user to fully control the formatting of the data.

Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore in view of Jones et al. ("Web-based Messaging Management Using Java Servlets", hereinafter "Jones"). Although Bickmore shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the presentation manager server system of claim 27 (see 102 rejection above), Bickmore does not show the use of servlets. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious (addition/modification) to the system disclosed by Bickmore as evidenced by Jones.

In analogous art, Jones discloses web-based messaging management using Java servlets. Jones shows:

"Cost: Free-use Java-based software libraries provide management-specific support, including the Internet Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP), topological map display, performance management, and fault management;

Security: Public-key security mechanisms can be incorporated directly into management applications, providing access control, confidentiality, and application-to-application authentication. In the case where web protocols are trusted, it becomes possible to issue management operations across security perimeters called "firewalls";

Flexibility: Software development environments and APIs are readily adaptable to suit custom requirements;

Evolution: There is a general industry migration trend towards secure, web-based management. Web browsers are ubiquitous and have become a common user interface to both the Internet and to management information; the tools for developing web-based applications have likewise become abundant and inexpensive. Management applications can evolve in concert with web-based management solutions developed by individual messaging component vendors.

Performance: The transfer of information over an unreliable network using web protocols is

superior in performance and reliability to the transfer of that information using the SNMP protocol. Thus, connectivity between management domains can be improved."

- Jones, conclusion, paragraphs 3-7

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of adjusting the system of Bickmore so as to use servlets, such as taught by Jones, in order to take benefit from the cost, security, flexibility, evolution, and performance advantages of servlets.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott M. Klinger whose telephone number is (703) 305-8285. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott M. Klinger
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

smk

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100